

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50 and 53-103 are currently pending with claims 2, 5, 53-58 and 89 being independent. Claims 2 and 5 have been amended; claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48 and 49 have been canceled; claims 89-103 have been added; and claims 53-88 have been withdrawn from consideration, leaving claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50 and 89-103 pending for prosecution with claims 2, 5 and 89 being independent. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 2, 14, 35, 41 and 47 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,179 B1) in view of Miyauti (JP 11-031587). Recognizing that Yamada does not describe or suggest a second insulating layer formed on the first electrode and the first insulating layer, and on which the organic compound layer is formed so that the first electrode is not in direct contact with the organic compound layer, the rejection relies on Miyauti as showing this feature. In particular, the rejection alleges that Miyauti specifically teaches the practice of depositing a thin insulation layer 3 between a first electrode 2 and an organic compound layer 4 and 5 in a light emitting device. However, Miyauti in no way indicates that the thin insulation layer 3 is a second insulating layer formed on a first insulating layer, as is recited in claim 2. Stated another way, Miyauti in no way describes or suggests placing the insulation layer 3 between a first insulating layer and the organic compound layer 4. Yamada also fails to describe or suggest placing an insulating layer between a first insulating layer and an organic compound layer. Accordingly, since both Yamada and Miyauti fail to describe or suggest this feature, any proper combination of the two would also fail to do so, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 8, 14, 35, 41 and 47 have been rejected as unpatentable over Yamada in view of Nagayama (JP 11-224781). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Nagayama, like Yamada and Miyauti, fails to describe or suggest a second insulating layer formed on the first electrode and the first insulating layer, and on which the organic compound layer is formed so that the first electrode is not in direct contact with the organic compound layer, as recited in claim 2.

The rejection alleges that Nagayama specifically teaches the practice of depositing a thin insulation layer 109 between a first electrode 102 and an organic compound layer 103 in a light emitting device. However, Nagayama, like Miyauti, fails to describe or suggest that the insulation layer 109 is formed between a first insulating layer and an organic compound layer 103. Since Yamada also fails to disclose this feature, as previously noted, any proper combination of the two would also fail to do so and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, 14, 17, 35, 38, 47 and 50 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Urabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,614,174) in view of Miyauti. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons discussed above and because, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Urabe does not describe or suggest the use of a second insulation layer between a first electrode and an organic compound film.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 23, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 50 and 52 have been rejected as unpatentable over Urabe in view of Nagayama, and claim 26 has been rejected as unpatentable over Urabe in view of Nagayama and Yamada. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for the reasons discussed above.

New independent claim 89 is similar in scope to claim 2, but recites a layer comprising carbon instead of the second insulating layer (see claim 14 which recites that the second insulating layer is comprised primarily of carbon). Since, for the reasons discussed above, Yamada, Nagayama, Miyauti, and Urabe all fail to describe or suggest such a layer positioned in the manner recited in claim 89, claim 89 is believed to be allowable over these references, as are its dependent claims.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Masayuki Sakakura et al.
Serial No. : 10/098,617
Filed : March 18, 2002
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-094001 / US5593/3617

The fee in the amount of \$120 in payment of the one-month extension fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/19/06

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W. - 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
/adt
40365942.doc



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640